DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 015 CS 508 421

AUTHOR Enz, Billie; Christie, James F.
TITLE Teacher Play Interaction Styles and Their Impact on Children's Oral Language and Literacy Play.
PUB DATE Dec 93
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (43rd, Charleston, SC, December 1-4, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Behavior; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Research; Communication Research; *Dramatic Play; Oral Language; *Play; Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Teacher Behavior; Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Styles; Emergent Literacy

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the styles teachers exhibit while interacting with children in literacy-enriched play settings, whether teachers switch between several different styles, and how different play interaction styles affect children's play behaviors. Subjects, seven 4-year-olds enrolled in a university laboratory preschool class, a lead teacher, two regular teachers, and a teacher assistant, were videotaped interacting on two occasions for a total of two hours of video per teacher. Composition of the play group was determined by the lead teacher to ensure that the group was diverse, cooperative, and cohesive. Teachers interacted with the children in their normal manner. Each teacher was also interviewed. Results indicated that (1) the "stage manager," "co-player," and "play leader" styles had a positive impact on children's oral language and the quality of their dramatizations; (2) with this particular group, the play leader style was the most effective for both dramatic and literacy play; (3) children did not sustain dramatic play when the teacher was uninvolved; and (4) when the teacher assumed the "director" role, the children's dramatic play became simple and repetitive. Findings suggest that teacher involvement can enhance children's pretend play, but that the teacher's play style is the critical variable. (Contains 3 figures of data and 16 references.) (RS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 366 015

# Teacher Play Interaction Styles and Their Impact on Children's Oral Language and Literacy Play

Billie Enz

James F. Christie

Arizona State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Enz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: TEACHER PLAY STYLES

CS 508421

Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Charleston, South Carolina, December, 1993.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Teacher Play Interaction Styles and Their Impact on Children's Oral Language and Literacy Play

Early childhood educators generally agree that play has an important role in children's development and should be a standard feature of preschool and kindergarten programs. Play's curricular status is apparent in position statements by leading professional organizations, which contain declarations such as "children learn through play" (National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1991, P. 26) and "teachers must take the lead in articulating the need for play in children's lives, including the curriculum" (Isenberg & Quisenberry, 1988, P. 139).

Considerably less agreement exists concerning the teacher's role in classroom play. Some experts recommend that teachers get

> directly involved by: (a) making

suggestions to children while they play or (b) by joining in and becoming the children's play partners (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987; Jones & Reynolds, 1992; Manning & Sharp, 1977). These play "interventionists" argue that direct teacher involvement can enrich children's play experiences and maximize play's impact on their intellectual and social development. They cite Vygotsky's (1978) "zone of proximal development," which asserts that adult support during play

can enable children to engage in activities that they could not do on their own.

Others expert have cautioned against excessive teacher involvement in play, citing examples of how overzealous or inappropriate intervention can disrupt children's play episodes and cause them to stop playing (e.g., Elkind, 1981). These "noninterventionists" express concerns that excessive teacher intervention can interfere with play's impact on development by reducing opportunities for discovery, problem solving, and peer interaction during play (Miller, Fernie, & Kantor, 1992; Pellegrini & Galda, 1993). For example, Pellegrini and Galda claim, "when children and adults interact, adults do most of the work" (1993, p. 169). Sutton-Smith (1990), one of the most vocal critics of adult intervention in play, goes so far as to state, "It is better to encourage children to play amongst themselves than to infect them with our own didactic play bumblings" (p. 5).

This controversy over teacher involvement in play has become an important issue in recent efforts to promote literacy-related play in classroom settings (Christie, in press). The general strategy has been to add theme-related print materials to sociodramatic (make-believe) play centers, with the goal making these play areas resemble the literacy environments that children encounter at home and in their communities. Cookbooks, coupons, empty food containers,

post-it notes, note pads (for messages and shopping lists), and pencils, could be added to the kitchen area of a home center, whereas a restaurant center might be equipped with menus, wall signs, pencils, and note pads (for taking food orders). It is hoped that such props would then invite children to incorporate familiar literacy routines into their play.

This type of "materials" intervention has often been combined with teacher involvement in play. The teacher first adds theme-related literacy materials to play areas and then uses coaching (making suggestions from the sidelines) or modeling (taking a role and joining in the play) to encourage the use of these print materials during play.

Three quantitative studies have compared "materials only" and "materials plus teacher involvement" treatments (Christie & Enz, 1992; Morrow & Rand, 1991; Vukelich, in press). In all three studies, trained teachers or research assistants used child-centered forms of intervention which extended the children's current play activities. For example, if several children in the housekeeping area were planning trip to a nearby store center, the adult might suggest making a shopping list (Christie & Enz, 1992). Results of all three studies showed that this combined intervention was more effective in encouraging literacy activity during play than adding the materials alone.

Findings of qualitative studies paint a rather more complex picture, suggesting that how teachers intervene in play is of crucial importance. Schrader (1990) observed four kindergarten teachers interacting with children in literacy-enriched play settings and found that the teachers used two different types of interaction styles: (a) extending, in which they built on children's own themes and interests (i.e., the same strategy as used in the three quantitative studies), and (b) redirecting, in which they ignored the children's current play interests and directed them to an unrelated literacy activity. Schrader found that the extending-style interactions were very effective in eliciting literacy play, whereas the redirecting style intervention usually disrupted the make-believe play frame and caused the children to cease playing. The teachers differed in their use of these strategies. One consistently using extending-style interactions, while the others used both styles on a regular basis.

Roskos and Neuman (1993) observed six experienced preschool teachers and discovered that they used a repertoire of roles -- onlooker, player, and leader -- to encourage literacy-related play. These veteran teachers switched roles frequently, depending on the children who were playing and the nature of play. These teachers' ability to switch roles

to fit the children's "play agenda" appeared to be as important as the interaction styles they used.

The present study attempted to shed further light on teacher play interaction styles by addressing these questions:

1) What styles do teachers exhibit while interacting with children in literacy-enriched play settings?
2) Do teachers have one consistent play interaction style or do they switch between several different styles?
3) How do different play interaction styles affect children's oral language, literacy activity, and play behaviors?

## Method

### Subjects

Four teachers participated in the study: a lead teacher (female), two regular teachers (male), and a teacher assistant (female). The lead teacher had more than a decade of preschool teaching experience, whereas the two regular teachers were both novices. The teacher assistant had very limited teaching experience.

The children were seven 4-year-olds enrolled in a university laboratory preschool class. They were from a

variety of ethnic (African-American, Anglo, Hispanic, and Native American) and economic (low and middle-income) backgrounds. Composition of this play group was determined by the lead teacher, who considered a number of factors, including gender, language, personalities, play styles, and pre-existing friendships. The goal in establishing play groups was to ensure that each group was diverse, cooperative, and cohesive.

Setting

Observations were conducted in the "big muscle room" of the preschool. This room contained tumbling mats, a piano, an elevated loft with stairs, a dress-up area, a house center with miniature kitchen furniture and appliances, and a "rotating" theme center configured to resemble different community settings (store, pizza parlor, beauty shop, etc.). Writing materials were available in both the house and theme centers, and child- and teacher-made signs were often displayed in these play areas and on the loft.

Data Collection

Prior to the beginning of this study, the researchers informally observed the normal classroom routines and play behaviors of the subjects. Each teacher was observed and video-taped interacting with the play group. This practice taping was conducted to solve any technical problems and to

acclimate the teachers and children to the presence of the video equipment and researchers.

Data collection consisted of each teacher being observed and video-taped interacting with the play group on two occasions, for a total of two hours of video per teacher. A sum total of eight hours of teacher-play group interactions were recorded. One investigator operated the video camera from a vantage point where almost all of the room could be observed. The children tended to cluster together, but when they were dispersed in several different areas, the camera would focus on those who were interacting with the teacher. An omni-directional microphone was able to pick up almost all of the dialogue that occurred in the room.

While one investigator operated the video camera, the other scripted the play session. These field notes identified the main play themes that emerged from the dramatic play, and described the various actions and dialogue of the teachers and children. Particular attention was given to the activity of children who were not being filmed by video camera.

The researchers made no attempt to influence or modify the natural play styles of the teachers. The teachers were asked to interact with the children in their normal manner. However, the teacher assistant was asked to serve as a control and only monitor the safety of the children as they

played. (This "uninvolved" style also happen to be her normal way of interacting with children during play). Neither the teachers or teacher assistant were aware that literacy play was a focus of the study.

At the conclusion of the study, each teacher was interviewed about his/her attitudes about teacher involvement in play.

Data Analysis

To begin to analyze the data, each play session was transcribed. These transcriptions documented the actions and dialogue of both the teachers and children that occurred during each minute of the play session.

Initial analysis focused on identifying and describing characteristic features of each teacher's play style(s). This information laid the foundation for a continuum that allowed us to contrast how the teacher's different interactions styles influenced the children's language, literacy-related behavior, and the evolution and quality of their play episodes.

## Results

1. What styles did the teachers exhibit while interacting with children in literacy-enrich play settings?

Like Roskos and Neuman (1993), we witnessed a range of teacher play styles/roles. We consistently saw four types of adult play styles, plus the teacher aide's deliberate "uninvolved" response. Based on distinct and observable teacher behaviors, we labeled these styles as Stage Manager, Co-Player, Play-Leader, and Director. The characteristic behaviors of these adult play styles are as follows:

Stage Manager. Teacher actions that are representative of this style include responding to the children's requests for materials, making props, and helping the children to construct costumes and organize the play set. Though stage managers also make appropriate theme-related script suggestions to extend the children's ongoing dramatic play, they do not take a role and join in the play. They remain outside the children's play "frame."

Co-Player. The teacher extends or accepts an invitation to play and actually becomes an actor in the children's dramatizations. The co-player takes a minor role in the drama, such as a customer in a store or a passenger on a plane. The prime roles (pilot, store clerk) are left for the

children. While enacting this role, the teacher carefully follows the flow of the dramatic improvisation, letting the children take the lead. The teacher subtly enriches the play by engaging in dialogues, suggesting plot ideas, and helping to define roles and responsibilities of the different characters.

Play Leader. Like the co-player, the play leader takes on a role and actively participates in the children's play. However, play leaders exert more control over the course of the play by introducing new elements or plot conflicts. For example, in the role of an airplane passenger, the teacher might complain, "Whenever I fly this airline, I'm always late! Attendant, go tell the pilot to hurry. What is taking so long?"

Director. Directors takes over total control of the play by deciding what the theme will be, assigning roles, delegating props, and/or directing the children's actions and dialogue. Rather than taking a role in the play, directors remain on the "sidelines" and exert control by asking literal questions ("Is that a birthday candle?), giving directions ("Count the candles on the cake"), or narrating the children's actions ("We're playing birthday party").

Uninvolved/Safety Monitor. This behavior was coded when teachers: (a) attended to nonplay tasks, such as preparing for the next lesson; (b) used verbal warnings to control

children's behavior; or (c) talked with other adults or children not currently in the play group.

2. Did the teachers have one consistent play interaction style or did they switch between several different styles?

To determine the consistency of adult play style, each minute of the video transcript was analyzed. For each minute, the adult dialogue was coded as Uninvolved/Safety Monitor, Stage Manager, Co-player, Play Leader, or Director. Occasionally, the adult would shift from one style to another during the minute. When this occurred, the behavior would be coded as .5 for each of the two play styles that was observed. Finally, the number of minutes each play style was observed was summed across the entire play period. Since the amount of playtime varied for each play episode, the total number of minutes for each play style was converted to percentages (see Figure 1.). To establish inter-rater reliability, both investigators coded all transcripts and then cross-checked each other's coding. Reliability ratings were established at 92%.

---

Insert Figure 1 about here

---

Unlike the Roskos and Neuman (1993) study, the three teachers we observed tended to demonstrate a play style preference. This was particularly true of the two less-experienced male teachers ("J" and "K"). During J's two play episodes, he spent 92% and 52% of the time in a "director" role. Likewise, K spent 88% and 87% in the play leader role during his two play sessions. In contrast, the experienced lead teacher "C" exhibited greater variation, but she assumed the stage manager (25% and 23%) and co-player (30% and 40%) styles most frequently.

All three teachers in this study did show an ability to shift play styles. This was most likely to occur when the children were engaging in potentially hazardous play. At this point each teacher switched to the role of a safety monitor. When the children requested props or materials, the teachers would usually switch to the role of a stage manager.

3. How did different play interaction styles affect children's oral language, play behaviors, and literacy activity?

Throughout these eight play episodes, we witnessed an array of children's play behavior. After the video transcript and detailed description of nonverbal play behaviors were documented, we began to identify consistent

behavior categories which we labeled as non-pretend activity, meta play, and pretend play. The descriptions of these categories are as follows:

Non-pretend activity occurred when children engaged in non-pretend forms of play (motor play, construction, or games) or in non-play activity (e.g., examining a lady bug in a jar). With this particular group of children, non-pretend activity usually consisted of climbing up and sliding down the loft, roughhousing, block throwing, or arguing with one another about taking turns or ownership of certain play materials.

Meta play occurred when children were involved in organizing the play set, establishing and discussing role functions, constructing props and costumes, or developing a screenplay. As the children organized the props or constructed the "set," they simultaneously talked about the dramatic play for which they were preparing. For example, while carrying chairs to make airplane passenger seats, one child said, "Let's pretend that I'm the pilot." Another child responded, "Yeah, let's go to Egypt."

Pretend play occurred when children assumed roles within the ongoing drama and spoke "in character." In an airplane dramatization, for example, a child enacting a flight attendant might say, "Fasten your seat belts. We going to take off!"

To determine how different adult play styles might have affected the children's play behavior and subsequent interactions with literacy materials, we analyzed each minute of the video transcript. For each minute, the children's dialogue was coded as either non-pretend activity, meta play, or pretend play. Another category, which we labelled "No talking," was also identified to account for the time when there was only adult talk. Since several children may have spoken during the course of a minute, more than one play behavior might have been observed. When this occurred, the behaviors would be coded as a decimal, depending on the number of other play behaviors observed. Any literacy activity was noted at this time. Next, the number of minutes each play behavior was observed was tallied for all children across the entire play period. Since the amount of playtime varied for each play episode, the number of minutes each play behavior was observed was converted to percentages. Finally, for each play episode, the teacher's play styles were plotted against the student's play behavior on a minute-by-minute basis to determine if an interaction or correlational pattern emerged (see Figure 2).

---

Insert Figure 2 about here

---

To determine if different adult play styles affected the children's oral language, we totaled the number of words the children and teacher spoke during each play episode. Since the amount of playtime and total number of words for each play episode varied, the word totals for teachers and students were converted to percentages (See Figure 3). We also compared the number of words the teachers and children spoke per minute and the mean length of the children's utterance across each play episode.

---

Insert Figure 3 about here

---

The following scenarios illustrate how each play style either facilitated or impeded the children's oral language, play behavior, and literacy opportunities:

Stage Manager. As demonstrated in Figure 2, each teacher began their play episodes with the children in the role of stage manager. This style appeared to encourage a great deal of meta play conversation amongst the children. The following scenario is an example of a typical stage manager conversation.

Teacher C: Did you guys say something about being in kindergarten today? I brought some paper just in case you want to.

Brittany: Let's play kindergarten, Buddy! Let's play!

Buddy: Ok.

Brittany: But we really... But we really have to be quiet and we can't talk. You can't move!

Buddy: Ok, this can be the circle!

No examples of literacy play were observed while teachers were in the role of stage manager.

Co-player. The adult co-player style appeared to encourage the children's meta and pretend play efforts. While enacting a minor role in a child-initiated drama, teacher would suggest plot ideas, help define roles and responsibilities of the different characters, and make role-appropriate comments. This, in turn, appeared to facilitate dialogue. The co-player style was also successful in generating some opportunities for literacy play. Teacher C used the co-player style most frequently. In the following example, she is playing the role of a passenger on airplane trip:

Buddy: This could be an airplane. Hey, it could be an airplane! [Lots of activity as everyone becomes excited and brings props on board, e.g. hats, baggage.]

Teacher C: I think we have to pack some clothes. Maybe we should bring one of these pouches. This is my getting on the airplane hat.

Buddy: If you're going to wear that hat [sombrero], you have to go to Texas.

Teacher C: Maybe that's where I'll go... Texas. Texas would be a good place to go.

Brittany: Buddy, I could be the server. Buddy, I have a great idea, why doesn't this be the bed?"

Buddy: Oh, yeah!!!!" [Then he lays down on the bed].

Play Leader. Our observations revealed that the play leader interaction style generated intensive pretend play, including detailed characterization and sophisticated plot development. Since the play leader interjected theme-appropriate plot conflicts, these dramas tended to have a distinct beginning, crises, and a resolution. This interaction style appeared to stimulate the children's language and literacy production. During a play leader session, there were many instances of emergent reading and writing. The play leader style also encouraged meta play behaviors. The following is an example of how Teacher K used the play leader style to extend an airplane dramatization:

Talia: Give me the tickets for everyone.

Teacher K: Okay, give everyone a ticket [gives Talia some "tickets" that have been made by Noah].

I'm going to put my bags over here. Okay, I've got my bags. Someone's got to carry my bags to the plane.

Noah: Here, K [gives K a ticket made with scribble writing].

Teacher K: Another ticket? Good. Frequent flyer plan!

Noah: One for me, too.

Teacher K: Okay, I need to give you money for these [hands Noah some play money].

Noah: One for me, too. I'm a coming, too. [Noah makes a sign using scribble writing and posts it on the ticket counter to let people know he has gone on a vacation.]

Noah: How about me, K?

Teacher K: Okay, we're bringing our baggage. Hurry up. We'll be late for our flight. We got to carry our bags up.

For the next five minutes, K and the children get the plane ready to take off. K has complained that whenever he flies this airline, he is always late. All the children are intensely engaged in the drama as K continues to keep the drama moving forward in a logical progression. His contribution is filling in sequential details and providing appropriate theme-related vocabulary for the improvisational

drama. K is sensitive to the children's script/action suggestions, using them as a springboard to the next event.

Director. The children responded to this type of play style by demonstrating repetitive pretend behaviors. Their play followed a strict course and was less spontaneous and creative than when other styles were used. The child actors did not appear to become immersed in their roles and often just "mimed" while the teacher narrated the predetermined script. Thus, the children's oral language was very limited. Though the children had several opportunities to write, these activities were controlled by the teacher and tended to be contrived. The following is an example of how Teacher J used this style to encourage the children to enact a birthday party:

Teacher J: Brittany, come here. Do you get to wear a party hat? Would you like to wear this? This is the special one for the birthday person. Could you put that on? It's like a crown.

Brittany: No. I already have this [referring to her hair ornament.]

Teacher J: Can you make us a sign for November? We have to pretend it's your birthday."

[Brittany goes to get paper to make a sign].

Teacher J: Let's make your sign.

["J" passes out clay and candles.]

Brittany: Real candles?

Teacher J: Paco, Paco. Do you want to make the cake? Who wants to make the cake?

Brittany: Not me; I'm the birthday girl.

Teacher J: But, see, look at it. She's gonna put candles on the cake, too. Real candles! How about if we make two cakes? Paco, you make one. You get one candle. No, you have to make the cake. Everyone gets a candle. And then, Joseph, you get one too. You have to make the cake. Make the cake first, and then we'll put the candles on.

Teacher J: [to Brittany] Where's the sign that says 'November'?

[Brittany takes her sign, moves to the table, and begins to write her November sign].

One child, Paco, who was new to class and who could speak little English, did respond well to this style during the birthday party episode. He silently carried out J's directions and appeared to be enjoying himself. This was the only time that we observed Paco participating in make-believe play.

Uninvolved/Safety Monitor. Since this style offered so little support, it is not surprising that these children, who were capable of highly complex social interactions and

lengthy (15-20 minute) dramatic play sessions, were unable to sustain their dramatic play for more than a minute or two. Further, during these brief play interludes, the children often had quarrels and injuries that required significant teacher mediation and attention. No literacy play occurred while this style was in use. Interestingly, the level of language use increased as the children quarreled with one another. The following is a brief sample of the behaviors that were observed when the assistant teacher "E" assumed the uninvolved/safety monitor role:

[Buddy, Joseph, and Noah have been involved in rough-and-tumble play for approximately 20 minutes. E has warned them consistently to be careful.]

Teacher E: Joseph, don't push him.

Buddy: Don't push him.

Noah: They keep jumping on me, teacher!

[Abby argues with Talia and Paco over an electric keyboard.]

Abby: You got a turn the other day, and I just got a little bit.

[Abby tries to push Talia's fingers off the keyboard.]

[Buddy is carrying the block chair up the steps. Joseph pushes Buddy down. Both boys giggle. Buddy then kicks the chair down the stairs.]

Teacher E: Boys! Be careful!

Buddy: [To Joseph] You started it.

Joseph: [To Buddy] You started it. You started to kick it down.

## Discussion

Contrary to what "noninterventionists" suggest, the results of this study indicate that teacher involvement can enhance children's pretend play. However, as our study also indicates, not all teachers interact with children in an appropriate, supportive manner. Thus, the teacher's play style appears to be the critical variable.

We found the stage manager, co-player, and play leader styles to have a positive impact on children's oral language and the quality of their dramatizations. With this particular group of children, the play leader style was the most effective form of teacher involvement. Play leaders created plot conflicts that, in turn, provided opportunities for the children to use their imagination and language to solve problems. The play leader style appeared to be the best approach for involving the "rough-and-tumble" boys in

this group in dramatic play. In addition, the play leader style was most successful in encouraging literacy play.

Two other styles -- uninvolved/safety monitor and director -- were much less effective. The children in this study were unable to sustain any type of dramatic play when the teacher was uninvolved. Instead, the boys engaged in endless rough-and-tumble play, while the girls quarreled over turn-taking with the play materials. When the teacher assumed the director role, the children's dramatic play became simple and repetitive. Their oral language also became stilted. It is interesting to note that the two least effective styles are on opposite ends of the teacher involvement continuum. Apparently play can be adversely effected by not enough or too much adult involvement.

The three effective styles -- stage manager, co-player, and play leader -- are located in the middle of this continuum. The teacher supplies varying amounts of scaffolding but still allows children to remain in control of their play activities. This was true even in the play leader style, the most directive of the three roles. Teacher K, the consummate play leader, always took cues from the children when introducing new elements to the drama. Thus he was extending what the children were already doing rather than directing the play.

The major limitation of this study is that it involved only 4 teachers and 7 children. This limitation raises several questions about the findings:

1. Are these play styles peculiar to these teachers or typical of teachers in general?
2. Will the less-experienced male teachers maintain a play style preference, or did the interpersonal dynamics of Play Group A influence the teachers to adopt a particular play style?
3. Would other children respond in the same way to these adult play styles? Though outwardly representative of most four-year-olds, this play group's reactions to the different play styles may have been unique.

The fact that other investigators have reported similar teacher play styles suggests that categories arising from this study are generalizable to other teachers. For example, the player and leader roles delineated by Roskos and Neuman (1993) correspond closely with our co-player and play leader styles. In addition, several of the roles described by Jones and Reynolds (1992) are similar to our categories: mediator (safety monitor), stage manager (stage manager), player (co-player) and "interrupting" behavior (director).

The research reported in this paper is part of a larger study. Thus, the children described above (Play Group A) represent only one of three play groups we documented

interacting with the four teachers. Once we analyze how the teachers interacted with the other two groups of children (Play Groups B and C), we will begin to have answers to the second and third questions. Preliminary analyses suggest that the two less experienced male teachers did maintain their play interaction style preference with all three groups of children. However, these groups of children appeared to respond differently to the various forms of teacher interaction. For example, the play leader role, which worked so well with the children in Group A, was not very successful with Group B. These tentative findings support Roskos and Neuman's (1993) suggestion that teachers need a repertoire of play interaction styles and skill at choosing the optimal styles to use with specific children in different situations.

We did not observe many attempts by the teachers to encourage children to incorporate literacy into their play, even though opportunities were available. This implies that it would be beneficial for teachers to do some advance planning about the literacy possibilities within a play theme. This would, in turn, enable them to take advantage of opportunities that arise naturally in the course of the children's play.

Further research is needed to better understand the different ways in which teacher interact with children during play and how these interaction styles affect children's play

behavior. If optimal play interaction strategies can be identified, then this knowledge can be disseminated to practitioners through preservice and inservice teacher education programs. Knowledge of such strategies can help teachers enrich children's classroom play experiences. This, in turn, should increase play's contributions to children's language, literacy, and social development.

References

Christie, J. (in press). Literacy play interventions: A review of empirical research. In S. Reifel (Ed.), Advances in Early Education and Day Care (Vol. 6). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Christie, J. F., & Enz, B. (1992). The effects of literacy play interventions on preschoolers' play patterns and literacy development. Early Education and Development, 3, 205-220.

Elkind, D. (1981). The hurried child: Growing up too fast too soon. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Isenberg, J., & Quisenberry, N. (1988). Play: A necessity for all children. Childhood Education, 64, 138-145.

Jones, E. & Reynolds, G. (1992). The play's the thing: Teachers' roles in children's play. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Manning, K., & Sharp, A. (1977). Structuring play in the early years at school. London: Ward Lock Educational.

Miller, S., Fernie, D., & Kantor, R. (1992). Distinctive literacies in different preschool play contexts. Play and Culture, 5, 107-119.

Morrow, L. M., & Rand, M. K. (1991). Preparing the classroom environment to promote literacy during play. In J. F. Christie (Ed.), Play and early literacy development (pp. 141-165). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1991). Guidelines for appropriate curriculum content and assessment in programs serving children ages 3 through 8. Young Children, 46(3), 21-38.

Pellegrini, A. D., & Galda, L. (1993). Ten years after: A reexamination of symbolic play and literacy research. Reading Research Quarterly, 28, 163-175.

Roskos, K., & Neuman, S. B. (1993). Descriptive observations of adults' facilitation of literacy in play. Early Childhood Research Quarterly 8, 77-97.

Schrader, C. (1990). Symbolic play as a curricular tool for early literacy development. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 5, 79-103.

Sutton-Smith, B. (1990). Playfully yours. TASP Newsletter, 16(2), 2-5.

Vukelich, C. (in press). Learning about the functions of writing: The effects of three play interventions on children's development and knowledge about writing. Journal of Reading Behavior.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of psychological process. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

Wood, D. McMahon, L., & Cranstoun, Y. (1980). Working with under fives. Ypsilanti, MI: High Scope.

Figure 1

## Percentage of Teachers' Play Styles:

| Teacher | Date | Minutes | Unin | SM | CoP | Play L. | Dir | Theme(s) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| "J" | 17-Apr | 33 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 92 | Birthday Party/ Fire Drill |
| "J" | 1-May | 25 | 22 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 52 | Airplane/ Doggie play |
| "C" | 7-Apr | 32 | 42 | 25 | 30 | 3 | 0 | Boat/ Slide/ Plane |
| "C" | 29-Apr | 40 | 29 | 23 | 40 | 7 | 1 | School/ Airplane trip |
| "K" | 4-Mar | 31 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 88 | 0 | Airplane trip |
| "K" | 26-Mar | 23 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | Airplane trip |
| "M" | 14-Apr | 28 | 93 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Rough & Tumble |
| "M" | 13-Apr | 10 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Rough & Tumble |

Univ = Uninvolved
SM = Stage manager
CoP = Co-player
PlayL = Play Leader
Dir = Director

# ORAL LANGUAGE

**Figure 3**

| TEACHER | MINUTES | DATE | TOTAL WORDS | % ADULT | % CHILD | ADULT WPM | WPM CHILD | MLU |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| "J" | 33 | 4/17/94 | 1,641 | 87 | 13 | 43 | 6 | 4 |
| "J" | 25 | 5/1/94 | 1,266 | 59 | 41 | 30 | 23 | 4 |
| "C" | 32 | 4/7/94 | 1,539 | 78 | 22 | 38 | 11 | 6 |
| "C" | 40 | 4/29/94 | 2,024 | 66 | 34 | 33 | 17 | 6 |
| "K" | 31 | 3/4/94 | 2,332 | 68 | 32 | 51 | 24 | 7 |
| "K" | 23 | 3/26/94 | 1,729 | 75 | 25 | 23 | 19 | 6 |
| UNIV. | 28 | 4/14/94 | 501 | 27 | 73 | 5 | 13 | 3 |
| UNIV. | 10 | 4/13/94 | 238 | 24 | 76 | 6 | 18 | 3 |

Figure 2

Date: 3/1/94 Teacher: Kurt

| Time | T.P.S | CPB | LITERACY ACTIVITY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9:18 | | | |
| 9:19 | | | |
| 9:20 | | | |
| 9:21 | | | |
| 9:22 | | | |
| 9:23 | | | |
| 9:24 | | | |
| 9:25 | | | |
| 9:26 | | | |
| 9:27 | | | |
| 9:28 | Stage Manager | M | |
| 9:29 | Stage Manager | P | |
| 9:30 | PL | M | |
| 9:31 | PL | M | |
| 9:32 | Stage Manager | M | |
| 9:33 | PL | P | |
| 9:34 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:35 | PL | P | Money |
| 9:36 | PL | P | Money |
| 9:37 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:38 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:39 | PL | P | Money |
| 9:40 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:41 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:42 | PL | P | |
| 9:43 | PL | P | |
| 9:44 | PL | P | |
| 9:45 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:46 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:47 | PL | P | Tickets |
| 9:48 | PL | P | |
| 9:49 | PL | P | |
| 9:50 | PL | P | |
| 9:51 | PL | P | |
| 9:52 | PL | P | |
| 9:53 | PL | P | |
| 9:54 | PL | P | |
| 9:55 | PL | P | |
| 9:56 | PL | P | |
| 9:57 | PL | P | |
| 9:58 | PL | P | |
| 9:59 | PL | M | |
| 10:00 | | | |

# Continuum of Adult Involvement

Supporting

Uninvolved | Audience | Stage Manager | Co-Player | Play-Leader | Directing

Assumes Role and Within the Role:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Safety monitor | Verbal and Non-Verbal Support | Gathers materials | Mediates Dialog | Introduces conflict | Delegates Props |
| | | Makes Props | Guides Plot | Facilitates Dialog | Directs Actions |
| | | Constructs Costumes | Defines Roles & Responsibilities of Different Characters | Problem Solving | Directs Dialog |
| | | Organizes set | | | Asks Literal Questions |
| | | Script Suggestions | | | Narrates Activities |

# Continuum of Child Responses

Short episodes of dramatic play

Monster/Doggie/ Superhero play

Small Group

Parallel Play

**Preparation:**

Organizing playset, establishing roles, labeling props, assembling costumes, constructing props.

**Meta Play:**

Developing screenplay ("Let's pretend that")
Discussion of role function & characterization

**Role Play:**

Immersion into character/role
Intense dialog
Plot development, conflict & resolution

Repetitive pretend behaviors

Sporadic play episodes

Pantomine

Enz and Christie, 1993